

## **Workplan for Developing Water Quality Common Program**

### **Purpose:**

The purpose of the work proposed in this workplan component is to develop a detailed description of the actions contained in the water quality common program, to set criteria for evaluating water quality actions and to determine the range of combinations of actions which accomplishes the water quality objectives at the highest level consistent with cost effectiveness evaluations.

### **Proposed Approach:**

The urban water interests have been meeting for some time on this issue and have proposed water quality constituents and the associated criteria for evaluating alternatives from the urban drinking water perspective. Similar efforts need to be taken on the agricultural water quality and ecosystem water quality areas. Key representatives will be identified in the Ag water districts to come together in a technical team to review the technical work previously performed in this area, as supplemented by the consulting team. There is much less previous work available for ecosystem water quality. Key ecosystems water quality experts from EPA, USF&WS, California Fish and Game, and DWR will be asked to serve on a task force to identify criteria for evaluating water quality actions.

Once water quality constituents and the associated criteria are identified in each of the three areas (urban, Ag, and ecosystem), representatives of each of the three groups will be convened to resolve any conflicts between criteria.

The consultant team will develop "straw" proposals for criteria for each of the groups. Concurrent with that effort they will develop descriptions of the actions for the common program and model and evaluate the relative effectiveness of actions in meeting the adopted criteria. Cost effectiveness evaluation will also be performed to develop the combination of water quality actions which meet the program objectives (as measured by the evaluation criteria) in the manner most consistent with cost effectiveness.

The linkage with ecosystem health will be handled through joint evaluation criteria while the linkage to the storage/conveyance component will require a separate evaluation of the storage/conveyance requirement to satisfy water quality criteria.

### **Team Approach:**

Actions to improve water quality will be analyzed and modeled using a "working team approach" which combines CALFED staff and water quality planning experts from the CALFED agencies with a consulting team acting as an "extension of staff". The agency experts will need to be physically located with CALFED team to make this approach effective. This approach will take full advantage of the expertise available within the agencies while making use of the resources of the consulting team.

### **Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation techniques (analytical tools) which were developed during the Programmatic EIS/R workshops for the water quality elements will be utilized to evaluate the relative effectiveness of the actions in the common programs in meeting the program objectives. An analysis of the cost effectiveness of each action will also be prepared. The working team of CALFED staff, agency staff and consulting team members will jointly formulate the most technically effective and cost effective actions into a program which is staged over time so as to accomplish the highest improvement in water quality for the dollar invested with an emphasis on early achievement of water quality improvements.

The evaluation techniques will then be applied again to the formulated program to identify possible improvements in staging, and after a review by the working team and the PCT a recommendation on the Water Quality Program will be made to CALFED.

## Water Quality Component Work Plan

### Task Description

The major tasks associated with the general approach outlined above include:

<u>Task Description</u>	<u>Responsible Team Member</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Target Completion Date</u>
<b>Component Refinement</b>		7/ 1/96	10/1/96
• Complete review of literature and existing studies	CT <sup>1</sup>	7/1/96	7/10/96
• Identify representatives for Ag W.Q. Tech Team and Ecosystem Tech Team	PT <sup>2</sup>	7/1/96	7/5/96
• Prepare "straw" proposal for W.Q. Program staged over time utilizing Phase I analysis (Preliminary W.Q. Program)	CT	7/1/96	7/25/96
• Prepare "straw" proposals for Ag W.Q. and Eco. WQ Constituents, Criteria and W.Q. Program	CT	7/1/96	7/10/96
• Ag W.Q. Tech review "straw" Ag W.Q. Constituents Criteria, and W.Q. Program	PT	N/A	7/25/96 and 8/8/96
• Ecosystem W.Q. Tech Team review "straw" Eco. W.Q. Constituents, Criteria and W.Q. Program	PT	N/A	7/25/96 and 8/8/96
• Meet with State Board, Reg. Board & EPA staff to review Prelim. W.Q. Program	PT & CT	7/25/96	8/19/96
• Develop linkages of W.Q. Program actions to conveyance/storage	CT	7/25/96	8/19/96

---

<sup>1</sup>CT = Consultant Team

<sup>2</sup>PT = Program Team

<u>Task Description</u>	<u>Responsible Team Member</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Target Completion Date</u>
• Prepare evaluations (model runs) of actions identified in W.Q. Program to determine ability to meet objectives (criteria prepared by Tech Teams) and rank	CT	7/25/96	9/2/96
• Reformulate W.Q. Program as appropriate	CT	8/19/96	9/2/96
• Prepare cost estimates of actions and rank by cost effectiveness	CT	8/26/96	9/2/96
• Review modeled W.Q. achievement and cost effectiveness of W.Q. Program	PT & Tech Teams	9/3/96	9/12/96
• PCT Review & Discuss W.Q. Program	PCT	9/11/96	9/18/96
• Evaluate positive and negative impacts of conveyance/storage options on W.Q. Program	CT	9/2/96	9/16/96
• Prepare year by year program implementation W.Q. Program scheduled by W.Q. achievements, cost effectiveness and customized by alternatives	CT	9/16/96	10/1/96
• Prepare Pre-feasibility Report on W.Q. Program	CT	10/1/96	10/31/96

### **Impact Analysis and Reformulation (10/1/96 to 3/30/97)**

<u>Task Description</u>	<u>Responsible Team Member</u>	<u>Start Time</u>	<u>Target Completion Date</u>
• Impact Analysis of W.Q. Program	CT	10/1/96	1/30/97
• Reformulate W.Q. Program to reduce impacts and take advantage of linkages to other components	CT & PT	2/1/97	2/14/97
• Additional impact analysis	CT	2/15/97	2/27/97
• Reformulation as required	CT & PT	3/1/97	3/15/97
• Final Impact Analysis	CT	3/16/97	3/30/97

c:\yaeger\index\wqcompwk.pln